

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 MATTHEW MULLINS,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 SAMANTHA POWERS, et al.,

7 Defendants

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00727-APG-DJA

**Order Accepting Report and  
Recommendation and Dismissing Case**

[ECF No. 10]

8 On January 31, 2025, Magistrate Judge Albregts recommended that I dismiss this case  
9 with prejudice because plaintiff Matthew Mullins has been unable to successfully state a claim  
10 despite repeated attempts. ECF No. 10. Mullins did not object. Thus, I am not obligated to  
11 conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring  
12 district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified  
13 proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,  
14 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings  
15 and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

16 I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Albregts’ report and recommendation  
17 (ECF No. 10) is accepted and plaintiff Matthew Mullins’ third amended complaint (ECF No. 9)  
18 is dismissed with prejudice. The clerk of court is instructed to close this case.

19 DATED this 20th day of February, 2025.

20 

21 ANDREW P. GORDON  
22 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23